UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/571,503	03/10/2006	Jean-Yves Bitterlich	071308.1015 4152 (2003P13403WO		
31625 BAKER BOTT	7590 08/04/2009 CS L.L.P.	19	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA		PHANTANA ANGKOOL, DAVID			
98 SAN JACIN AUSTIN, TX 7	TO BLVD., SUITE 15 8701-4039	000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2175		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/04/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applica	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary			503	BITTERLICH, JEAN-YVES		
			er	Art Unit		
		David P	hantana-angkool	2175		
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this commun Reply 	ication appears on t	he cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress	
WHIC - Exten after 9 - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M sions of time may be available under the provisions BIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply is specified above, the maximum sta to reply within the set or extended period for reply toply received by the Office later than three months a d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication. atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	FHIS COMMUNICATIC event, however, may a reply be t will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror pplication to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•	
Status						
2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	2b)∏ This action is for allowance exce	ot for formal matters, p		e merits is	
Disposition	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) <u>4-12</u> is/are pending in the all lands of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>4-12</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restricted.	re withdrawn from o				
Application	on Papers					
10) 🔲 7	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or ction to the drawing(s the correction is requ) be held in abeyance. So uired if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 C	, ,	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (For the control of the control o	TO-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date		

Application/Control Number: 10/571,503 Page 2

Art Unit: 2175

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This application has been reassigned to Examiner David Phantana-angkool.
- 2. This action is responsive to Amendments filed on April 23rd, 2009.
- 3. Claims 4-12 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent claims.
- 4. Applicants amended claims 4, 7, and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fernandes, US# 6,014,135.

As for independent claim 4:

Fernandes shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device, comprising of:

- activating <u>at the object computer</u> a local file processing function on the <u>processing</u> computer
 (Fernandes show activating an icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43. Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68),
- generating an object processing platform by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer

Art Unit: 2175

(Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63 and column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6).

• wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area (Fernandes shows moving the object in 11:40-43).

As for dependent claim 5:

Fernandes discloses the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the processing computer (10:30-40).

As for dependent claim 6:

Fernandes shows the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is converted into application-specific data (10:40-45).

As for independent claim 7:

Fernandes shows a system for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device (Fernandes show activating a an icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43 and Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68), wherein the object computer is operable to activate a local file processing function on the processing computer, wherein the object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer, and wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the

Art Unit: 2175

object from the object computer to the interaction area (Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6).

As for dependent claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for independent claim 10:

Fernandes shows a system comprising:

a combination of an object computer and a processing computer, wherein the combination is operable to perform an ad hoc screen assembly to couple a respective input and/or output device (Fernandes show activating a an icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43 and Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68), wherein the object computer is operable to activate a local file processing function on the processing computer, wherein an object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer, and wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area (Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface

Art Unit: 2175

screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6.

As for dependent claims 11 and 12:

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 04/23/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding 35 USC 103(a) rejection:

As for independent claim 4:

8. Applicant argues Fernandes fails to teach moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer (Applicant's Remarks, Pg. 5).

The Office respectfully disagrees.

9. It is noted that Fernandes shows the following limitations in Column 11, lines 35-55 and Column 12, lines 58-68. Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The limitations argued by the applicant above is fairly broad. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by both the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6.

As for independent claims 7 and 10:

With regard to independent claims 7 and 10, the applicant argues the same argument as presented above. Thus as indicated in the above discussion, the same rationale/rejection applies to independent claims 7 and 10.

Application/Control Number: 10/571,503 Page 6

Art Unit: 2175

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/571,503 Page 7

Art Unit: 2175

DP /David Phantana-angkool/ Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Adam L Basehoar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178